Disclaimer: The contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law. This document is only intended to help facilitate public input regarding COVID-19 vaccines and mandates. A person should consult an attorney familiar with international, federal, state, and local laws regarding the contents found in this document before engaging in litigation efforts.

NOTE:

1) This document is part of the public domain and no copyrights are claimed by the author.
2) Copy and paste into your favorite editing software.
3) When (name) is used that is where one would put the name of the CEO or Company name as directed.
4) This document injects evidence that can be used in future court battles. The CEO will not be able to use ignorance or FDA approval as justification.
5) An enormous amount of research time has been spent developing this document with the Supreme Court in mind. Therefore, defend your rights by sharing this information with as many Americans as possible and as fast as you can. We are in a battle of narratives, and should the truth of this document become common knowledge, there won't be a need for court battles.

The letter starts below this line

TO: (Company Name)

SUBJECT: (Company name) mandating employees show proof of vaccination for COVID-19 virus as a condition of employment.

The recent mandate that I must receive a COVID vaccination as a legal condition for maintaining my employment has caused me legal and health-related concerns for my family and my community. The objective of this letter is to provide (CEO) with information that demonstrates the need to cancel this illegal decision within the next 24 hours.

LEGAL CONCERNS

Due to the fact that you have mandated that I show proof of vaccination by (put date here) despite the approved vaccine COMIRNATY not physically available leads me to believe you are mandating that I use the experimental vaccine label, Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Let's discuss why that mandate is illegal and how (name of CEO) is engaging in acts of harassment and intimidation for which I will seek immediate legal remedy should those actions toward me not cease.

The FDA licensed the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine for the purpose of preventing COVID-19 in citizens 16 years of age and older and labeled that drug COMIRNATY. On the same day, FDA officials authorized an application for an Investigational New Drug called Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine using IND number 19736. The FDA then updated their Emergency Use Authorization to provide guidance for its use.

The FDA stated the following:

1) "The licensed vaccine has the same formulation as the EUA-authorized vaccine and the products can be used interchangeably to provide the vaccination series without presenting any safety or effectiveness concerns. The products are legally distinct with certain differences that do not impact safety or effectiveness."
2) "Although COMIRNATY (COVID-19 Vaccine, mRNA) is approved to prevent COVID-19 in individuals 16 years of age and older, there is not sufficient approved vaccine available for distribution to this population in its entirety at the time of reissuance of this EUA."

3) “All descriptive printed matter, advertising, and promotional material relating to the use of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine clearly and conspicuously shall state that: This product has not been approved or licensed by FDA, but has been authorized for emergency use by FDA, under an EUA to prevent Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) for use in individuals 12 years of age and older…”

In plain language these statements declare the two vaccines use the same formula but are legally distinct with certain differences. The reason for issuing the EUA was because COMIRNATY isn’t available in known quantities for distribution. Finally, FDA officials told Pfizer to state on all printed materials that Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine “has not been approved or licensed by FDA” even though it was just approved. Yes, extremely confusing I know.

Statement of Fact: The Pfizer vaccines have the same formula, but they do not have the same label. The label on a drug vial determines what laws are applied when administering the contents of the vial. Therefore, governments should clarify with the FDA what they meant when they said, “the products can be used interchangeably to provide the vaccination series.” Did they mean the manufacturer or did they mean vaccination providers? Is it legal to take the contents out of a vial labeled “not approved” and pour it in a vial labeled “licensed?” I think not.

EUA drugs are legally considered experimental for the purpose of conducting biomedical research and have the backing of international and federal laws preventing participants from suing pharmaceutical companies relating to adverse reactions. Furthermore, there are numerous Federal Code of Regulations governing biomedical research including how such research can be conducted on prisoners, children, and the general population.

Pharmaceutical companies have the backing of law specifically because they rely on a voluntary and informed consent process. By participating in an experimental drug a citizen is declaring they have been informed of the potential side effects of the drug and have made an informed consent to participate in the biomedical research regardless of possible adverse reactions. They also have been informed that by using the EUA drug they are forfeiting all rights to legally seek compensation for those adverse reactions.

This is confirmed by reading EUA drug fact sheets that must state, “under the EUA, it is your choice to receive or not receive the vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.”

In 2003, US District Judge Emmet G. Sullivan ruled against the DoD mandatory anthrax vaccination program stating, “This court is persuaded that AVA is an investigational drug and a drug being used for an unapproved purpose.”

FDA officials used some sleight of words in their EUA when they said, “[BioNTech vaccine] has been authorized for emergency use by FDA, under an EUA to prevent Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) for use in individuals 12 years of age and older.”

The play on words by FDA officials further confuse an already bewildered legal community. The drug is authorized to be used in biomedical research and nothing more. Simply stating what you hope to achieve in that research does not legally change the fact the drug has not been approved for a specific purpose. Therefore, Judge Sullivan’s ruling still applies to all EUA COVID-19 vaccine mandates.

Judge Sullivan reveals why governments can’t force citizens to take an experimental drug stating, "Absent an informed consent…the United States cannot demand that members of the armed forces also serve as guinea pigs for experimental drugs.” Therefore, informed consent is a direct requirement for anyone desiring to serve as a “guinea pig for experimental drugs,” including those within the United States Military.

Mandates operate under the premise that undesirable actions will be brought to bear on a citizen to do something against their will or better judgment if they refuse to become compliant. Since biomedical research using experimental drugs requires voluntary and informed consent as a condition for participation, then mandates requiring employees to use the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 or other EUA COVID-19 vaccines are illegal and extremely immoral.

Since no licensed vaccine exists for use I have made the assumption that your mandate will require me to participate in Pfizer’s biomedical research using the experimental drug called Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19. The legal consequences for (CEO name) requiring employees to take a vaccine that isn’t licensed by the FDA should be legally concerning to (him or her). This is because (CEO NAME) has threatened employees with undesirable actions if they refuse to participate in biomedical research. This is an illegal act of harassment and intimidation leading many in the company to experience undesirable strains of emotional stress. Therefore, employees have a strong legal case to bring civil action suits against (CEO name) for mandating an action that is physically impossible for them to fulfill.

Mandates to use the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine could void all insurance claims for adverse reactions. Why? Because the employee "voluntarily" participated in a biomedical research project outside the contractural agreements of the insurance company. COMIRNATY is a fully licensed drug by the FDA for the explicit purpose of preventing COVID-19. Whereas Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine is an experimental drug for the purpose of conducting biomedical research. Since there wasn't an immediate medical need for participating in the EUA drug, insurance claims are in danger of not being paid. I'm concerned that you're not working to protect the financial affairs of my family.

Statement of Fact: Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine is a New Investigational Drug using NID 19736. Pfizer must abide by international, federal, and state laws governing biomedical research for this drug. The medical community is required to abide by the Code of Federal Regulations governing the administration of this drug. Failure to do so could result in criminal charges and most certainly civil lawsuits. Participants in the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 biomedical research must give their informed consent and volunteer out of free will. Consent under duress can not be considered voluntary and, as such, your mandate endangers the school with serious legal consequences.

The company mandate that an employee participate in biomedical research using an experimental drug for purposes of being studied as a guinea pig is unethical, immoral, and highly illegal. The failure of (CEO name) to faithfully fulfill (his or her) fiduciary responsibilities of adhering to laws that govern biomedical research has placed (him or her) squarely in the crosshairs of civil lawsuits and criminal charges.

Therefore, since the vaccine mandate violates the legal rights of employees to opt out of biomedical research, I suggest you rescind your mandate to protect your financial future, personal liberties, and the rights of our employees. Should you choose to ignore the contents of this letter I will have no choice but to pursue civil litigation against this company and stakeholders. I will also request local and state authorities investigate crimes that have violated the human rights of all employees; rights protected by federal laws and international treaties.

<u>Health Concerns</u>

Recent information has come to light that officials within the FDA approved Pfizer's COMIRNATY vaccine using a failed clinical trial. Pfizer's clinical trial was designed to run for 24 months, demonstrate a 50% vaccine efficacy rate at the end of that trial, and prove safe for users since they were using a brand new and

untested vaccine technology. The FDA committed to providing clinical trial data to the public for public input. However, facts of the study have come to light bringing into question the viability of COMIRNATY to protect users against COVID-19 variants and the safety of its use.

The clinical trial failed within the first 6 months and ended on March 13, 2021. By the end of the sixth month Pfizer had lost 93% of their total blinded group participants. They were only able to show an 84% vaccine efficacy rate in the remaining 7% of participants. However, given the fact that less than 8% of Americans even contracted the virus during the same time the trial was being conducted, there are suspicions of effectiveness when reading the results.

Pfizer stated in its July ’21 preprint that, “data presented here [clinical trial] do not address whether vaccination prevents asymptomatic infection.” This is a strange statement to make since the vaccine isn’t designed to prevent symptoms; it’s designed to prevent contracting the virus altogether. Pfizer noted the vaccine was losing 6% effectiveness every two months proving they could not reach the required 50% VE at the conclusion of their clinical trial. This alone should have prevented FDA officials from approving the drug. The failure of the BioNTech vaccine was noted by Israel’s Ministry of Health who showed that by the 8th month after the second shot the vaccine efficacy dropped to 16%.

The FDA refused to release the raw clinical trial data to the public as promised, knowing that such action would force them to deny the approval of the COMIRNATY vaccine. Lastly, pro-vaccine industry peers petitioned FDA officials to not approve the vaccine prior to the completion of clinical trials. They said there is no legitimate reason for approving the drug early, and I agree, given the fact the vaccine could still be administered under the EUA without pause.

The adverse reaction rate for RNA vaccines in general brings into question the safety of this brand new and untested vaccine technology. The CDC tracked a total of 1,230,785 adverse reactions for 94 vaccines through the end of August ‘21. The two RNA vaccines account for nearly 50% of all deaths and 45% of all adverse reactions while the other 50% are spread among 92 other vaccines. As a point of contrast, let us look at a drug called Bextra. Bextra was pulled from the shelves after Pfizer had to pay a criminal fine of $2.3 billion for drug fraud. Bextra had 12,318 adverse reaction cases reported with 1,054 of those being labeled as death. Those cases were collected over a span of 18 years. However, In less than 12 months, Pfizer’s vaccine collected 300% more reports of death and 1,929% more adverse reactions in total than Bextra did in 18 years. These adverse events are growing in number and are being confirmed by active medical doctors.

COMIRNATY's drug insert gives us an alarming warning for school age children as it states, "Postmarketing data demonstrate increase risks of myocarditis and pericarditis, particularly within 7 days following the second dose. The observed risk is higher among males under 40 years of age than among females and older males. **The observer risk is highest in males 12 through 17 years of age**."

This brings me to question how the (CEO Name) determined a benefit to risk assessment leading to the vaccine mandate. According to the CDC there have been 33,909 presumed or confirmed COVID-related deaths for ages 18-49 since the pandemic began March of 2020 through September 8th, 2021. As a reference, there have been 478,303 deaths for ages 18-49 for all related diseases just in 2021. Therefore, we can see the pandemic has not created a medical emergency within working age employees sufficient to issue a vaccine mandate. Furthermore, the risks associated with the use of the vaccine for ages 18 through 49 years appear to greatly outweigh the risks of COVID-related complications.

The above statement is clearly demonstrated when one views the CDC reports of confirmed covid hospitalizations by age. The report shows that from June through August of 2021 there were an estimated 800 hospitalization visits per week for ages 18-49 for lab confirmed covid cases. This means that on average 16 employees age 18-49 were admitted to a hospital in an entire state for COVID-related complications each week for the above time period.

To determine an honest benefit to risk analysis we must know how COVID-related compilations compare to Pfizer's BioNTech related complications.

The CDC provides guidance by studying their adverse reporting system for ages 18-49. According to CDC adverse reports regarding Pfizer's vaccine there have been:

Death	233
Life Threatening	1,529
Permanent Disability	1,618
Hospitalized	4,209
Existing Hospitalization Prolonged	47
Emergency Room	17,401
Doctors visit	24,414
Other complications	65,946
Total	115,397

The data shows us there are an estimated 3,000 patients being admitted to medical care each month for 18-49 years of age for COVID related complications. This means there is one patient on average age 18-49 being admitted to a hospital per county once a month for covid related complications. Compared that to 6,500 patients seeking medical attention a month for complications relating to the use of Pfizer BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. The average hospital stay for COVID related complications is 2 days.

One is left wondering how (name) assessed a benefit to risk analysis that led to mandating a vaccine that has twice as many complications as the virus itself does. Given the fact that Pfizer vaccine has a known failure rate built into the drug how can (CEO Name) justify playing Russian Roulette with the lives of (his or her) employees.

It appears to me that (CEO) issued a mandate that forces employees under duress to participate in biomedical research using an experimental drug to be studied as a guinea pigs by a pharmaceutical company with a known history of drug fraud. (he or she) issued this mandate without fulfilling the required fiduciary responsibilities of ensuring (his or her) recommendation was, in fact, the safest and healthiest option for students in our community.

Should we spend an hour discussing the research demonstrating previously infected persons with COVID have 1200% more protection against the Delta variant compared to Pfizer vaccinated persons? Or how we now have highly effective therapy treatments for patients diagnosed with COVID not available to us in 2020, negating the need to use questionable vaccines?

The legal implications of mass lawsuits by employees from now and years to come is too great of a liability for (name of the company) to manage. Therefore, in light of what has been presented, I suggest (CEO) immediately rescind all mandates to use a COVID-19 vaccine as a condition of employment. Should the (CEO) ignore this suggestion I will have no other option but to seek remedies in civil courts. I will request criminal investigations on the basis that (CEO) willfully ignored the contents of this letter and pursued a personal political agenda instead of fulfilling (his or her) fiduciary responsibilities to protect the health and safety of employees of (company name). I'm not sure (CEO) is ready to present the benefit to risk assessment (he or she) used when making the decision to mandate the vaccine on healthy employees. When an employee is given a Pfizer BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine, they are playing a game of Russian Roulette with their lives. Therefore, mandates must prove a massive benefit with record low adverse reactions which is not the case with RNA vaccines.

Let me end by quoting Japanese philosopher, Miyamoto Musahsi, who said, "Truth is not what you want it to be; it is what it is, and you must bend to its power or live a lie."

(CEO Name), our company policy must not be a byproduct of emotional strain. We all desire a magical pill that will make COVID-19 go away. However, let us not rush into solutions based on emotionalism. Let us keep the light burning within our scientific community to help them find a solution to our current plight while at the same time protecting those most vulnerable from the madness such emotionalism has caused humanity over the centuries.

Kind Regards,
TheRepublicJournal.Com